

MAR 17 2006

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MANINDER KAUR,

Petitioner,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 04-74158

Agency No. A78-638-628

MEMORANDUM^{*}

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted March 8, 2006^{**}

Before: CANBY, BEEZER, and KOZINSKI, Circuit Judges.

Maninder Kaur, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order affirming the Immigration Judge's ("IJ") denial of her applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the BIA’s decision, *Shah v. INS*, 220 F.3d 1062, 1067 (9th Cir. 2000), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA’s and IJ’s adverse credibility findings are supported by substantial evidence, as Kaur testified inconsistently to events central to her claim. *See Li v. Ashcroft*, 378 F.3d 959, 962-63 (9th Cir. 2004). In addition, the BIA and IJ properly found that Kaur failed to provide corroboration to support contradictory evidence regarding her identity and to supplement her lack of knowledge about her family’s history of problems with the police. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Sidhu v. INS*, 220 F.3d 1085, 1089-92 (9th Cir. 2000). Finally, the BIA and IJ properly explained how Kaur’s demeanor detracted from her credibility. *See Singh-Kaur v. INS*, 183 F.3d 1147, 1151 (9th Cir. 1999).

In the absence of credible evidence, Kaur has failed to show eligibility for asylum or withholding of removal. *See Farah*, 348 F.3d at 1156. Because Kaur’s claims under CAT are based on the same facts that the BIA and IJ found to be not credible, and Kaur points to no other evidence the BIA and IJ should have

considered, she has failed to establish that the record compels eligibility for relief under CAT. *See id.* at 1157.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.